



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,045	12/11/2001	Ramesh Sundaram	S01.12-0881	7113

7590 07/16/2003

Deirdre Megley Kvale
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY
International Centre, Suite 1600
900 South Second Avenue
Minneapolis, MN 55402-3319

EXAMINER

NOLAND, THOMAS

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2856

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/015,045	Applicant(s) Sundaram et al
Examiner Tom Nelson	Group Art Unit 2873

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/21/03, 4/3/03 & 4/25/03
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 11-26 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 11-16, 18-21, 23 and 26 is/are rejected.
- ☒ Claim(s) 17, 22 and 24-25 is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
- ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) 9 filed 2/21/03
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other: _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2856

1. The request for continued examination (RCE) filed on April 3, 2003 for continued Examination of application 10/015,045 per 37 CFR 1.114 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The amendment filed Feb. 21, 2003 has been entered.
3. Claims 11, 14, 19-20, 23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Voldman et al US 5,559,051.

Note col. 2, lines 28-43 and Figs. 1. Use of both multiple rows and columns is clearly disclosed.

Re claim 14 herein note claim 7 of Voldman et al.

re claim 26 Voldman et al discloses the use of conventional techniques and lapping is a form of milling.

4. Claims 12-13, 15-16, 18 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voldman et al US 5,559,051 in view of Smith, Jr. US 6,112,401.

Voldman et al does not specifically set forth the use of rails, the particular dimensions claimed or that the transducers could be piezoelectric transducers. However, such would have

Art Unit: 2856

been an obvious expedient to have been produced with a manufactured glide head array similar to that of Voldman et al since such features are known to be useful in similar glider/slide head systems as evidenced by Smith, Jr. especially in col. 3, lines 49-67; col. 4, lines 41-43; col. 7, lines 1-30 and col. 11, lines 5-18 therein and thus in corporation therinto would have been obvious in view of the known utilities of such features.

5. Claims 12-13, 15-16, 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Voldman et al US 5,559,051 in view of Aylwin et al US 5,452,166.

Aylwin et al is applied analogously to Smith, Jr. in the previous rejection. Note especially col. 6, line 44-col. 8, line 7 in Aylwin et al.

6. Claims 17, 22 and 24-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-16, 18-21, 23 and 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2856


Applicants arguments against Voldman et al were not against it being used as a primary reference as now applied. Applicants' arguments against Smith, Jr. and Aylwin et al were not directed to their use as secondary references as now applied.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tom Noland whose telephone number is (703) 305-4765. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Hezron E. Williams, can be reached on (703) 305-4705.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

7/15/03
Thomas P. Noland
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2856


T NOLAND/pj
07/01/03